



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,926	03/31/2004	Andy Schwammberger	52318/TJD/M881	7919
57715	7590	06/01/2007	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP P.O. BOX 7068 PASADENA, CA 91109-7068				SHAFFER, RICHARD R
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3733		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
		06/01/2007		
		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,926	SCHWAMMBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard R. Shaffer	3733	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 35-54 and 56-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 35-54 and 56-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/29/2007.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 59 recites the limitation "soft" in line 2. Such language was not originally used in the filing of the application and it is unknown what the scope of such language is. It is recommended applicant deletes the phrase "soft to be" from claim 59 in order to have a claim fully supported by the disclosure as originally filed.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 61 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 61, the phrase "in particular" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 35-38, 40-54, 56, 57, 59, 60 and 63-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dall et al (US Patent 5,665,089).

Dall et al disclose (Figure 8) a system comprising: a main plate (81) with passages (48) extending parallel to the plane defined by the main plate; prefabricated elongate flexible connection elements/wire/thread (64) pass through the passages (48); each connection element is different with respect to shape, size or length (impossible to have perfectly uniform thickness, plus the length will be cut according to different orientations and encircling different anatomies); a flexible (relative term) outrigger (82) perforated with a plurality of holes/ring sections adapted to receive at least five (Column 5, Lines 1-2) bone screws (80); the holes are in a grid-like shape; the outrigger (82) has a base area smaller (the thickness along the bone is shorter) than that of the main plate; the device is intended to have the free ends of U-shaped (when bent around) wires (64) fixed remote (See Figure 8) from the outrigger (82) and is inherently capable of being twisted or tied instead of crimped; the outrigger and main plate are offset from one another and can have the distance between them controlled by the connection elements (64); the main plate has a hook-like element (the base portion is concave and thus both

side edges can be "hooks"); and the outrigger and connection elements when fixed together are unreleasably connected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 39, 58, 61 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dall et al.

Dall et al disclose all of the claimed limitations except for the outrigger and connection element are formed in one piece, the "thickness" of the outrigger is less than half the "thickness" of the main plate, and that the outrigger is made of a bioabsorbable material plastically deformable at temperatures between 50 and 90 degrees Celsius.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the outrigger and connection element as one piece since the court has held "that the use of a one piece construction instead of the structure disclosed in the prior art would be merely a matter of obvious engineering choice." See *In re Larson*, 340 F.2d 965, 968, 144 USPQ 347, 349 (CCPA 1965). This limitation would broadly read upon the limitation of the thickness of the outrigger being less than half the thickness of the main plate.

However, in order to maintain a consistent interpretation, it would have further been an obvious matter of design choice to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to have an outrigger with less than five fastening holes and thus have a "thickness" less than half of the main plate since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select a bioabsorbable material which is plastically deformable between the temperatures of 50 and 90 degrees Celsius since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard R. Shaffer whose telephone number is 571-272-8683. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7am-5pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on 571-272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Richard Shaffer

Richard Shaffer
May 26th, 2007

EDUARDO O ROBERT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER